

County of Fairfax, Virginia

ADDENDUM

MGHA			
	ADE	ENDUM NO. 1	DATE: March 15, 2012
TO			
TO:	ALL PROSPECTIVE O	FFERURS	
REFERENCE:	RFP2000000131		
FOR:	Consultant Services for Engineering Services	Transportation and Urban F	Planning, Design &
DUE DATE/TIME:	April 4, 2012 @ 3:00 P	M.	
The referenced reque	est for proposal is amende	d as follows:	
1. Remove-delete page 60, with the title, "Price Summary Instructions."			
2. The deadline for submitting additional questions is March 21, 2012.			
Attached are responsive received on the subject		re-proposal conference held	on March 7, 2012 and Emails
All other terms and co	onditions remain unchange	ed.	
Joseph M Gr	nzen		
Joseph M. Brozena, C Contract Specialist	CPPB		
THIS ADDENDUM IS REQUEST FOR PRO		IS CONSIDERED A PART	OF THE SUBJECT
		Name of Firm	
(Sign	ature)		(Date)
A SIGNED COPY OF	THIS ADDENDUM MUS	T BE INCLUDED IN THE TE	CHNICAL PROPOSAL OR

RETURNED PRIOR TO THE DUE DATE/TIME.

Note: SIGNATURE ON THIS ADDENDUM DOES NOT SUBSTITUTE FOR YOUR SIGNATURE ON THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL DOCUMENT. THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL DOCUMENT MUST BE SIGNED.

- Q1. Section 13.6 on page 7 in the Special Provisions of the RFP states that by executing the cover sheet (DPSM32), we agree to be bound by the terms and conditions contained in the RFP. It does not seem to leave any room for raising any terms that we might be interested in negotiating in the event the County were to want to award a contract. When raised at the Pre-Proposal Conference, you indicated that the County would be amenable to negotiation, within reason, of certain terms and conditions, and that we should simply point them out and list them in our proposal. We intend to write a statement in our cover letter "reserving the right to negotiate certain terms and conditions" and then list those of concern in our Business/Cost/Pricing Proposal. Can you please confirm that this is an acceptable approach, and that our Proposal will not be considered non-responsive by these inclusions?
- A1. The terms in the General Conditions and Instructions to bidders (Appendix A) are not negotiable and some are not applicable to this RFP. Certain terms in the Special Provisions are negotiable and some are based on what the offeror is changing. Proposals will not be deemed to be non-responsive.
- Q2. Section 5.3 includes the following tasks along with many others; Is it required that the proposer have the ability to perform all of these tasks to be considered eligible for this section? If we demonstrate deep experience in the remainder of the tasks could we still be qualified?

Vehicle Inspection
Vehicle Specifications
Vehicle Maintenance System and Inspection
Operator Training
Operations and Maintenance Training
Development of Maintenance Standards

- A2. The offeror should be responsive to these issues. If the offeror does not have this expertise, it would be advisable to engage a subcontractor with that expertise.
- Q3. Page 35 of the RFP notes that the Department feels there should be 10% DBE participation. The following page (page 36) has a goal of 6.9% for Female owned businesses and a Minority owned business goal from Attachment A of 28%. I would like to confirm that the goal outlined on page 35 is the correct goal for our use as we prepare the RFP.
- A3. For Federal funded projects the goal is 10%. As for the County projects, there is no goal set for the County projects however the participation of minority owned businesses is encouraged.
- Q4. Is an offeror who does not have an office in Fairfax County or in Virginia be required to have a Business, Professional and Occupational License?
- A4. Please call the Department of Tax Administration at 703-222-8234 to determine if a Business, Professional and Occupational License is required (Ref. Paragraph 65, of the General Conditions & Instructions to Bidders). This will also be verified by the Department of Purchasing and Supply Management prior to making an award.
- Q5. Should the Cover Sheet (DPSM32) be bound into either the Technical or Cost Proposals, or should it be loose within the sealed package? If it should be included in the Technical Proposal, in what section should it be included?
- A5. It is recommended that the cover sheet (DPSM32) be attached to the front of the Technical Proposal.
- Q6. Should the Cost Proposal be submitted in a sealed envelope separate from the Technical Proposal?
- A6. The Cost Proposal should be separate from the Technical Proposal. These need to be marked accordingly and can be submitted in one envelope.

- Q7. RFP Item 13.1 states that offerors must include a notarized statement that the CD version is a true copy of the printed version. Should this statement be bound into either the Technical or Cost Proposals, or should it be loose within the sealed package? If it should be included in the Technical Proposal, in what section should it be included?
- A7. The notarized statement should be included in the Technical Proposal. There is no specific section where to include the statement.
- Q8. The RFP appears to contain some conflicting cost terms. Page 55 of the RFP states, regarding Direct Labor Cost, "The fully burdened labor rate includes actual salaries and wages for employees directly chargeable to the project and includes fringe benefits for social security; workman's compensation; health, life and other insurance; retirement; bonuses; holidays; sick leave; and vacation. Do not include profit in the fully burdened direct labor cost." However, page 60 of the RFP states, "Direct Labor costs are defined as actual salaries and wages paid principals and employees for time directly chargeable to the project. Direct labor costs do not include fringe benefits such as social security contributions, unemployment, excise and payroll taxes, workmen's compensation, health and retirement benefits, sick leave, vacation, holiday pay, etc." One definition includes fringe benefits and the other does not.
- A8. Delete page 60.
- Q9. Section 5.2 includes the task, "Environmental Engineering." What does this include? Is this related purely to NEPA or does it include Hazardous Materials including, site assessments and remediation plans for contaminated soils.
- A9. The term "Environmental Engineering" is intended to refer to both NEPA analyses and other environmental evaluations such as environmental scans or assessments of environmental issues associated with a proposed project. It is not intended to include full mitigation measures such as remediation plans for contaminated soils.
- Q10. Should we include cost information for our sub-consultants in the Business Proposal?
- A10. Yes
- Q11. Please explain what is intended for Tasks 5.1 through 5.5?
- A11. For Tasks 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5, it was clarified that Tasks 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 are considered primary tasks and Tasks 5.4 and 5.5 are considered secondary tasks. The County may issue a contract that is based on the offeror's proposal for separate tasks for Task 5.1, 5.2, or 5.3. If submitting on only one of these tasks, the offeror should include relevant portions of Tasks 5.4 and 5.5 in their proposal. If submitting on all tasks, the offeror should include responses to Tasks 5.4 and 5.5.